

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/904,042 07/11/2001 K. Michael Han M-7468 US 1940 01/03/2002 7590 Theodore P. Lopez **EXAMINER** SKJERVEN MORRILL MacPHERSON LLP WOJCIECHOWICZ, EDWARD JOSEPH Suite 700 25 Metro Drive ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER San Jose, CA 95110-1349

2815

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/904,042

Applicant(s)

Han

Examiner

Edward Wojciechowicz

Art Unit 2815



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
A SH	for Reply ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
af: - If the	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed cation. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
- If NO co - Failur	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory immunication. To to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this y statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
	reply received by the Office later than three months after the rned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	e mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status		
1) 📙	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This ac	tion is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
-	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗌		is/are objected to.
8) 🗆		are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	objected to by the Examiner.
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) 🗆	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	ve been received in Application No
	 Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a list of the 	
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
Attachm		, priority and 00 0.0.0. 3 110(0).
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)2	20) Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/904,042 Page 2

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact structure and process for forming the claimed invention is not clearly understood. In claims 1 and 10, what is the relative difference in the thickness of the insulating layer over each region?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Application/Control Number: 09/904,042 Page 3

Art Unit: 2815

4. Claims 1-7, and 10-12 are rejected, insofar as they are understood, under 35
U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gardner et al. The reference to Gardner shows a FET
structure where the thickness of the gate insulating layer varies over different regions of the
device, as claimed. Specifically, Gardner teaches using a thicker dielectric layer in critical
regions of the device which are subjected to higher electric fields. See, for example, the Fig. 4
embodiment of Gardner, and the discussion at Col. 1, lines 25-47, and the discussion at Col. 3,

about 6Mv/cm at the edges of the gate electrode.

Gardner also uses dielectric thicknesses which are within the same order as that claimed by applicant, and also makes use of the same materials claimed, such as polysilicon gate

lines 15-24. As can be seen from this discussion, Gardner not only teaches the use of thicker gate

dielectric layers in certain places, but also recognizes the need to keep the electric field below

electrodes and silicon dioxide dielectric layers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-12 are further rejected, insofar as understood, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al, and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art, as

Application/Control Number: 09/904,042

Art Unit: 2815

discussed in the specification. While Gardner teaches the inventive concept, and structure of the

Page 4

invention with the formation of a gate dielectric layer which is thicker in areas over certain

regions, and thinner over other regions of the device, Gardner does not specifically refer to the

use of an ONO dielectric stack, or a control electrode, as claimed in claims 8 and 9. However, as

seen in the discussion of the prior art at page 1 of the instant specification, these features are well

known in this art, and would be commonly found in device structures such as Gardner's, which is

also applicable to FET memory devices.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to E. Wojciechowicz whose telephone number is (703) 308-4898, or to SPE

Eddie Lee whose number is (703) 308-1690.

EDWARD WOJCIECHOWICZ PRIMARY EXAMINER

EW:ew

December 31, 2001